

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROY O'GUINN.

**Plaintiff,**

3:20-CV-0273-APG-CLB

v.

LISA WALSH, et al.,

## Defendants.

## ORDER

Plaintiff has filed multiple affidavits, notices, and/or improper responses which do not appear to relate to any motion on file. (ECF Nos. 14, 16, 19, 22, 27, 29, 32, & 33). The Court is not a repository for the plaintiff's affidavits or evidence. Plaintiff may not file evidence with the Court unless it is used to support or oppose a motion. Therefore, ECF Nos. 14, 16, 19, 22, 27, 29, 32 & 33 are hereby **STRICKEN**.

Plaintiff is further advised that filing new motions or documents that are, in substance, identical to documents he has already filed, and/or filing motions seeking “updates” or immediate action on pending motions, will not increase the speed with which the court is able to proceed in this case. The court has a heavy docket. Plaintiff’s case is just one of hundreds before the court. Thus, Plaintiff’s repetitive (and borderline frivolous) filings only *slow* the pace of this litigation by requiring the court’s attention and consideration of small and secondary matters instead of the central issues in this case.

The court has been lenient because plaintiff is a *pro se* party. However, this does not give plaintiff a blank check to clutter the docket. See *Schenker v. Rowley*, No. 3:12-cv-00174-LRH-VPC, 2013 WL 321688, at \*3-4, 5-6 (D. Nev. Jan. 28, 2013). Plaintiff is warned that his status as an indigent litigant will not dissuade the court from considering sanctions against him for filing groundless and duplicative motions or other documents.

**DATED:** May 18, 2021

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**